



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/927,822	08/10/2001	Christian L. Kuiawa	18133-102	6244

30623 7590 06/01/2005

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY
AND POPEO, P.C.
ONE FINANCIAL CENTER
BOSTON, MA 02111

EXAMINER

PITARO, RYAN F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/927,822

Applicant(s)

KUIAWA ET AL.

Examiner

Ryan F Pitaro

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 2-18 have been examined.

Response to Amendment

2. Claims 2-18 are pending in this application. Claims 2-9, and 17 have been amended. Claims 19-21 have been cancelled. This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 2-4, 10-12, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayo et al. ("Mayo", US 5,751,965) in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("Applicant's admitted art").

As per claim 2, Mayo teaches in a system coupled to a plurality of devices, which are being monitored by the system, the system including a display, a method of monitoring diagnosed states of the devices comprising (col.5, lines 5-10); displaying a monitoring icon with a normal indication if each device being monitored by the system is diagnosed to be in a normal state (col.8, lines 23-47); and displaying the monitoring icon with an abnormal indication if at least one of the devices being monitored by the system is diagnosed to be in an abnormal state (col.8, lines 23-47). Although Mayo teaches monitoring a computer system with a plurality of devices, Mayo does not teach the

Art Unit: 2174

system coupled to a plurality of UPS devices. Applicants admitted art teaches the use of UPS devices within computer systems to be widely used (Specification, page 2, lines 16-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to monitor UPS devices using Mayo's method in order to monitor whether the system is being provided power and operating sufficiently.

As per claim 3, the method of Mayo and Applicant's admitted art teaches the method further comprising: diagnosing the abnormal state of the at least one UPS device as one of multiple levels of abnormal states; associating each level of abnormal state with a different abnormal indication; and displaying the monitoring icon with the abnormal indication associated with the diagnosed level of abnormal state of the UPS device (Mayo, col.8, lines 23-47).

As per claim 4, the method of Mayo and Applicant's admitted art teaches the method further comprising: prioritizing the multiple levels of the abnormal states; and displaying the monitoring icon with the abnormal indication associated with a first level of higher priority when a first UPS device of the UPS devices is at the first level of priority and a second UPS device of the UPS devices is at a second level of priority lower than the first level (Mayo, col 8, lines 23-47).

Independent claims 10 and 17 are similar in scope to independent claim 2, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 11-12 are similar in scope to claims 3-4 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

5. Claims 5-7 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayo et al. ("Mayo", US 5,751,965) and Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("Applicant's admitted art") as applied to claims 2-4, 10-12, and 17 above, and further in view of Chin et al. ("chin" US 6,456,306).

As per claim 5, the method of Mayo and Applicant's admitted art teaches the method as recited in claim 4, further comprising: opening a dialog window when the monitoring icon is selected (Mayo, col.2, lines 64-67; col.10 lines 47-52, Fig.12). However, the method of Mayo and Applicant's admitted art does not teach displaying in the dialog window a list of at least a portion of the UPS devices being monitored and corresponding states of at least some of the UPS devices on the list. Chin teaches a method of displaying the status of devices whereby a list of the devices is displayed with their corresponding state (Fig.6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Chin's teaching with the method of Mayo and Applicant's admitted art in order to view the overall state of all the devices simultaneously.

As per claim 6, the method of Mayo, Applicant's admitted art, and Chin teaches the method as recited in claim 5, further comprising: receiving an input selecting a UPS device from the list (Chin, col.6, lines 55-58), displaying a menu upon selection of a UPS device from the list, the menu comprising at least one UPS management function; receiving an input selecting a UPS management function from the menu; and causing

the UPS management function to be performed on the selected UPS device (col.8, lines 55-67; menu is only operable after selecting a device from the list.

As per claim 7, the method of Mayo, Applicant's admitted art, and Chin teaches the method as recited in claim 6, further comprising: opening a status window; and displaying in the status window at least one event associated with the state of a UPS device when the UPS device is selected from the list of UPS devices (Chin, col.6, lines 55-64).

Claim 13 is similar in scope to claim 5, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 14 is similar in scope to claim 7, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

6. Claims 8-9, 15-16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 4.

Mayo et al. ("Mayo" US 5,751,965), Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("Applicant's admitted Art"), and Chin et al. ("Chin" US 6,456,306) as applied to claims 2-7, 10-14, and 17 above, and further in view of Moore et al. ("Moore", US 5,825,656).

As per claim 8, the method of Mayo, Applicant's admitted art, and Chin teach the method as recited in claim 7, further comprising: displaying a selectable analysis icon (Chin, Fig.8, section 870-ANALYZE icon). However, the method of Mayo, Applicant's admitted art, and Chin does not teach displaying a power event analysis of a UPS device selected from the list of UPS devices when a power event analysis icon is

selected. Moore teaches a power monitoring system whereby the system displays power analysis of a device (Fig.8). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include Moore's teaching with the method of Mayo, Applicant's admitted art, and Chin in order to further analyze the device.

As per claim 9, the method of Mayo, Applicant's admitted art, Chin and Moore teach the method as recited in claim 8, further comprising: displaying a selectable analysis icon (Chin, Fig.8, section 870-ANALYZE icon and displaying a voltage analysis of a UPS device selected from the list of UPS devices when the voltage analysis icon is selected (Moore, Fig.7).

Claims 15-16 are similar in scope to claims 8-9 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 18, the method of Mayo, Applicant's admitted art, Chin and Moore teach the system of claim 16 further comprising means for diagnosing the state of a UPS device operably coupled to the system (Mayo, col.7, lines 30-35).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 3/24/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per claim 2, Applicant argues that Mayo fails to teach displaying a monitoring icon, which monitors devices. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As stated on page 6

Art Unit: 2174

of the arguments, Mayo teaches the connections to the network that includes the devices. Therefore Mayo teaches in turn monitoring the devices. The Examiner further points out the status of the icons depend on the devices themselves (Column 7 lines 5-29).

As per claim 10, Applicant argues that Mayo fails to teach the processor of claim 10. The Examiner respectfully disagrees, a processor is inherent to successfully run a user interface as shown in the teachings of Mayo.

As per claim 17, Applicant argues that Mayo fails to teach means for displaying a monitoring icon. The Examiner respectfully disagrees, and admits that a user interface as taught in Mayo inherently includes some type of device for displaying.

As per claim 5 and 13, Applicant argues that Mayo and the Background, in view of Chin fails to teach selecting a monitoring icon when opening a dialog window. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and further points out the citation (Mayo, Column 2 lines 64-67; Column 10 lines 47-52), and further points out (Mayo, Column 2 lines 45-46).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2174

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan F Pitaro whose telephone number is 571-272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm M-Th, and alternating F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Pitaro
Art Unit 2174
Patent Examiner

Application/Control Number: 09/927,822

Page 9

Art Unit: 2174

RFP

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100